

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ISAIAH KING PRZYMUS,
Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JILL ANN PRZYMUS,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
May 12, 2009

No. 288333
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 06-452127

Before: Sawyer, P.J., and Murray and Stephens, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(G); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The child came into care as an infant because respondent was only 16 years old and lacked the emotional and financial wherewithal to raise a child. The initial dispositional order was entered on May 2, 2006. Respondent was provided with services to help her accept responsibility for and learn to parent a child, and to function on her own as an adult. She struggled with a residential mother/baby program and transitioned to a series of supervised independent living placements where she continued to struggle. In March 2008, she conceded that she was still unable to assume custody of the child. The supplemental petition was filed on April 1, 2008. At that time, respondent had not completed school or obtained her GED, had not completed additional parenting classes, had not completed counseling, and was not visiting the child. Before the termination hearing she was given another opportunity to complete parenting classes, reinvest herself in counseling, and re-establish a bond with her child through visitation. Respondent did not enroll in parenting classes or counseling, visited the child just once, and failed to appear for the second day of the termination hearing. The trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination was warranted under §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j).

Further, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights was in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo, supra* at 356-357. Thus, the court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Christopher M. Murray

/s/ Cynthia Diane Stephens